1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
3	AT SEATTLE
4	
5	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) NO. CR12-001 RSL
6	Plaintiff,)
7	vs.) October 2, 2014
8) Seattle, Washington TIMOTHY DORAN,) 1:30 p.m.
9) Defendant.)
10	
11	TRANSCRIPT OF FELONY SENTENCING PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROBERT S. LASNIK
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
13	
14	For the Plaintiff: MR. BRIAN WERNER -and-
15	MR. ANDREW FRIEDMAN Assistant United States Attorney
16	700 Stewart Street, #5220 Seattle, Washington 98101
17	
18	For the Defendant: MR. DENNIS CARROLL Federal Public Defender
19	1601-5th Avenue, Ste 700 Seattle, Washington 98101
20	U.S. Probation Office: MR. MICHAEL MARKHAM
21	U.S. Probation Officer
22	Court Reporter: Leslie A. Waltzer, CSR
23	3641 North Pearl Street Tacoma, WA 98407
24	, i
25	(Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography;
-	transcript produced with aid of computer.)

1 (Defendant Present, in Custody) 2 THE CLERK: All rise. Court is again in 3 session, the Honorable Robert S. Lasnik presiding. THE COURT: Good afternoon. Thank you. Please 4 5 be seated. THE CLERK: Case CR12-001 RSL, United States v. 6 7 Timothy Doran. Counsel, would you please make your 8 appearances. 9 MR. WERNER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 10 Werner and Andrew Friedman on behalf of the United 11 States. With us at counsel table is Inspector Lisa 12 Stephenson from the United States Marshals Service. 13 THE COURT: Hi, Mr. Werner, Mr. Friedman and 14 Ms. Stephenson. 15 MR. CARROLL: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 16 Dennis Carroll on behalf of Mr. Doran. 17 THE COURT: Hi, Mr. Carroll and Mr. Doran. 18 And we have Michael Markham from U.S. Probation. 19 We're here for sentencing on Mr. Doran's plea of 20 quilty to one count of Failing to Register as a Sex 21 Offender. The Court has conducted a lengthy evidentiary 22 hearing that related to the allegation that Mr. Doran had 23 committed an illegal homicide in Vietnam involving a 24 woman who he dated there and who cared for his children.

I've issued an order regarding the sentencing hearing

25

that went out at the end of August, which found that the Court was satisfied by clear and convincing evidence that Mr. Doran did kill Ms. Ngoc in Vietnam, and that the Court would consider the parties' arguments regarding the appropriate weight to give to this finding in the context of all the factors identified in 3553, mitigating and aggravating circumstances and within the Guideline range for this crime, and I have since received additional briefing from both the government and from the defense and then a Supplemental Sentencing Memorandum from the defense.

I'm not going to list every document that I looked at, because there are so many that are in the court file, but all the material going back to the first scheduled sentencing and right through to today I have reviewed in preparation for the sentencing, including, of course, Mr. Facklam's original U.S. Probation Presentence Report and the various letters that Mr. Doran has submitted to me through the years and the pictures of the children which were submitted to me previously too, which I'm happy to return to Mr. Doran.

I know that there are issues that we have to deal with also later in regard to return of property, designation of a facility, timing of the commitment, et cetera, but we'll deal with those right after the

1 sentencing. 2 In terms of the materials that were submitted since 3 the order that the Court entered at the end of August, 4 Mr. Carroll, do I have everything you wanted me to have 5 in preparation for the sentencing? 6 MR. CARROLL: Yes, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: And have you had an opportunity to 8 go over the government's reports since then with Mr. Doran and make any additions or corrections? 9 10 MR. CARROLL: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Doran, are you ready 11 12 to proceed to sentencing today? 13 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 14 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Werner? 15 MR. WERNER: Thank you, Your Honor. 16 And appreciating that Your Honor has, as you said, 17 received substantial briefing, substantial evidence and 18 issued a substantial ten-page order on this case, I know 19 that Your Honor is very familiar with the facts of this 20 case and the law that has been referenced in this case, 21 but I still would like to discuss three things today, 22 Your Honor. 23 First, I want to discuss the -- the Guideline, the fact that you can -- this Court can sentence Mr. Doran --24 25 the law provides for this Court sentencing Mr. Doran

above the Guideline in this case. Second, the Court should sentence Mr. Doran above the Guideline in this case and, third, I'm going to advise the Court of the government's position related to supervised release conditions that were objected to in the defense's Sentencing Memorandum.

THE COURT: Great.

MR. WERNER: Your Honor, this Court can impose a ten-year sentence in this case. The Ninth Circuit law, while it is straight forward I think on this point, there are two things that a sentencing court's discretion is reined in by. First, there must be no procedural error; that is, the Court must correctly calculate the Guideline. The Court must not rely on any clearly erroneous facts. There must be no procedural error. And the second thing is the Court's sentence must be substantively reasonable. And, again, as the Court -- as the government stated in their Sentencing Memo, substantive reasonableness is not a point, but is a -- but is a range.

There are many cases cited by the government to Your Honor that say the Court may vary above the Guideline range, and there are many cases cited by the Court and many cases in my experience and probably the Court's experience where the Court has varied -- this Court and

other courts in this district have varied below the Guideline range. Reasonableness is a range, not a point.

Many -- one of those cases the defense wants to cite to this Court -- has cited -- is the Allen case. And, again, I don't want to belabor it, because I think the Court addressed it in its ruling, saying that, you know, the Allen case -- the Court does respect the Allen case or is going to follow the Allen case in the extent that you realize -- the Court realizes it's somewhat constrained in how much weight it can give to the murder that was committed by Mr. Doran in this case.

But I do want to point out that the Allen case is very factually different than the case we have before us today. The Allen case involved a 360-month sentence that was imposed on the defendant in that case for conduct that was not proved by -- not an actual murder, but conduct describing the desire to murder. And, finally, the sentencing in that case was different from this case in another way. That court actually adopted the Guideline range as if it was deciding a criminal sexual abuse.

None of those three things are at play here. This is not a 360-month sentence the government is asking for.

It's conduct that actually occurred. A woman is dead.

And, finally, the Guideline -- the government is not

asking that the Court use the Guideline range that would be in play for murder in this case.

Again, there are cases above the Guideline, there are cases below the Guideline, including the case of Fitch, which is the Ninth Circuit case that the Court has also referred to in its rulings in this case. That's a case where a 262-month sentence, a 22-year sentence, was imposed for bank device -- for bank fraud and access device fraud. Again, the law I think is clear that the Court can vary from the Guideline range and should tie that variance to 33 -- to 3553(a) factors.

I want to talk next about those factors and why the Court should vary from the Guideline range in this case. The history and characteristics of Mr. Doran, the need to deter Mr. Doran from future conduct, future criminal acts, and the need to protect the public from Mr. Doran are the three factors in Guideline -- in 3553(a) that the government has pointed to that counsel for a sentence of ten years here. I think there's three specific things that the Court can cite for -- three things that came up during the proceedings in this case that the Court can cite.

The first is the murder of Bich Ngoc Nguyen in Trang, Vietnam in March 2011 by the Defendant. This was a woman that the Defendant was dating. This was a woman that the

Defendant choked with his hands, murdered. This is a woman that the Defendant rolled up in a rug, hid in his house, and then fled the country. This is a woman that -- who was -- the Defendant had been in a relationship with, and the Defendant, rather than providing any sort of self-defense justification for this, immediately began telling stories to justify to others and probably to himself, Your Honor, why he had committed this horrendous act.

A man who could commit a murder like this with his bare hands, hide the woman in a -- throw a woman in a rug in a closet and then leave the country, this is a man who deserves to be in prison for ten years. A man who could make such calculated decisions to quickly leave the country, to try to talk to others, to try to set up a possible self-defense justification, this is a dangerous man, a man who should be sentenced to ten years.

But it's not just the fact that this is one murder, this is one act -- this is one act of anger that's separate, that is different from Mr. Doran's character, the characteristics that have been shown to this Court. His criminal history has two other similar incidents in its past. In 1990, Your Honor, the Defendant assaulted his then wife. He hit her, he kicked her, he bit her. In 1992 he assaulted by raping his ex-girlfriend. He

twisted her legs. He raped her. He began to -- he inserted foreign objects in her, and he turned on the gas and left her to die. Then the third incident, again, was the choking and murdering death of his ex-girlfriend in Vietnam. Three horrible instances of domestic violence. Three escalating incidents of domestic violence.

This is a violent man who seeks the control of people he's in relationships with and acted out on those -- his inability to control his own impulses at least those three times. A sentence of ten years is appropriate for someone with this criminal history, this type of criminal history.

The third thing I'd like to point to, Your Honor, is the statute itself that's at issue in this case. 2250(c) talks about the five years -- in addition to any sentence that should -- that's imposed on 2250(a), which is a failure to register, 2250(c) talks about imposing at least an additional five years on someone who commits a crime of violence while unregistered. That's what Mr. Doran did. Now, it doesn't technically apply here, because Mr. Doran wasn't in the United States when he killed Ms. Nguyen. But that's, I think, a strong indication of the fact that the sentence of ten years -- five years -- at least five years for the murder and five years or something less than that on the underlying

failure to register, for a total of ten years, is a substantially reasonable sentence.

Finally, Your Honor, I want to talk about the supervised release conditions that were proposed by the Probation Office and objected to by the defense. Your Honor, the government does not -- does not think that -- it would be -- accepts the Court not imposing a financial condition in this case; that is, access to Mr. Doran's financial records. That's not what this case is about. Although it is a good way to keep track of people by keeping -- having access to financial records, the government does not -- would not resist the Court striking that condition.

The government does believe that MRT, Moral Reconation Therapy, is justified here. The government does believe that drug and alcohol testing is advisable here, especially given Mr. Doran's past history with steroid abuse. I think that's something that the Probation Office -- a tool that the Probation Office should have in their kit, and the government does believe that mental health treatment should be provided -- should be ordered as a condition for Mr. Doran.

I think the -- it was the defense Sentencing Memo that mentioned that the FTC has diagnosed him -- or he gave an indicated of having PTSD. I think that alone is

justification for ordering a mental health evaluation as one of the conditions of supervised release for Mr. Doran.

As for the sex offender conditions, the government actually doesn't -- agrees with the defense. A lot of those conditions do not apply here. In fact, all of them, with the exception of one that's the condition -- proposed condition number nine, which orders a sexual deviancy evaluation. The government, after consulting with Mr. Markham, does think that that is an appropriate condition to keep in this case. The government would be okay with excising the two parts that the defense finds objectionable; that is, physiological testing, I don't think, is needed -- necessary to be ordered by the Court and the -- the idea of turning over past evaluations to the Court. The government is -- also would not object to the Court excising that part of the condition as well.

But, again, the government does believe that allowing the Probation Office to order a sexual deviancy evaluation is something that the Probation Office should be allowed to do here. While failure to register isn't a sex offense, Mr. Doran is a sex offender. He committed a sex offense, and this standing alone I think is justification for a sexual deviancy evaluation under the limited way I've described it.

Again, for the rest of the conditions, the rest of the sex offender conditions, Your Honor, the government does not support -- is okay with those being excised from the Judgment in this case. That's because, Your Honor, Mr. Doran's crime are not about sex. They're about control. Mr. Doran is a serial abuser of women. He is someone who is violent. He is someone who has sought to control the women in his life by violence, and he is someone who is dangerous, who is a threat to the public. The Court should sentence him to the maximum sentence available, that is, ten years.

THE COURT: Okay. Thanks, Mr. Werner.

Mr. Carroll?

MR. CARROLL: Thank you, Your Honor.

As the Tenth Circuit said in Allen, this is not an easy case. It's not an easy case under Booker, nor do I think it's as easy a case as the government would portray it to be. They indicated, well, it's straight forward under Booker, but I don't think, looking at the Allen case, that it's so straight forward.

Under Allen the Court does not have free rein under 3553 to make an extraordinary variance based on unrelated and uncharged conduct. It's tempting. I understand it's tempting to use the homicide as a means to punish Mr. Doran further for that -- for the murder,

particularly in a case like this where there's, at least right now, no extradition treaty. And there may be one in the future, but there doesn't seem to be one that's going to happen anytime soon. But the Court can't do that.

And the government couches their language in the 3553(a) factors, but the reality is that they're asking for punishment. As Mr. Werner said when he's describing the murder, this is someone who committed a murder, deserves to be in prison for that murder, and that's explicitly trying to punish Mr. Doran for that, although they do couch it in the 3553 factors.

And to be clear, I'm going to say this for the record, but I'm also saying it for Mr. Doran. Mr. Doran objects to the Court's finding that he committed this homicide. He is adamant that he is innocent of this homicide, and that he did not do this homicide, and that he should not be punished for it, and it should not be a factor in any way, shape or form here before this Court.

As his lawyer I'm cognizant of the Court's order and the subsequent order that that factual issue is closed at this point in time. And under Allen and Ninth Circuit case law, Fitch, we have the relatedness principle where the Court has to first begin with the Guidelines.

They're the benchmark, the anchor, with which this Court

must begin its sentencing analysis. There's no dispute here. Everyone agrees the range is 18 to 24 months.

And, yes, under *Booker*, this Court has the authority to vary from the Guidelines, but it's not unfettered.

And it's kind of ironic that the government now can use Booker, which is a case that protects defendant's -their Sixth Amendment rights and their Fifth Amendment
rights to have juries determine particular facts that are
used to -- in the sentencing process to enhance their
sentence, and that Booker decision is now being flipped
in this case to use uncharged, unrelated conduct that a
jury has not been asked to decide as a significant or
primary reason to enhance Mr. Doran's sentence.

And I think Allen is clear. Booker does not sanction an end run around the Fifth and Sixth Amendments. It puts a limit on the Court's ability. Particularly in a case where it's unrelated offense conduct, unrelated to the underlying conviction, I should say, the Court cannot simply just have free rein. Now, in Allen there's no mechanical or mathematical formula that the court gives us, but the court was clear that dramatic variances based on unrelated, unadjudicated conduct can violate the Fifth and Sixth Amendment.

Now, what Allen does do, although they reluctantly approve of it, is the horizontal departure that I

suggested in my -- my Memorandum. Now, they say it might be reasonable for the district court to consider Allen's uncharged conduct as a factor bearing on offender characteristics under Chapter 4. Although a stretch, it would be at least faithful to the Guidelines. And here the government and the Probation Department's recommendations are completely untethered from the Guidelines. There's no hook into the Guidelines. They agree that it's 18 to 24, but say forget about it.

Now, what I've suggested is if the Court is inclined to a horizontal departure -- now, to be clear, Mr. Doran is not conceding that a horizontal departure to a higher criminal history category is warranted. When Mr. Doran was released from prison in 1998, all the way up to 2011, there's no indication that he was engaged in criminal conduct. No contact with police. No arrest. Now, the government has attached to its Memo a restraining order that his ex-wife got during the course of a divorce and custody dispute. Now, I attached the ultimate custody order where Mr. Doran, after all that was aired before a superior court judge, got custody of his kids, so I would suggest the allegations of -- the government's argument that he's been abusing women for all that time is simply unwarranted in light of that evidence.

I've also provided the Court with a polygraph

examination that was done, I believe, in 2009 that indicated that Mr. Doran had not been engaging in any criminal acts since his release from prison. Also, there are numerous letters indicating that Mr. Doran is a good father. He's someone who cares about his children and, frankly, I haven't had -- I don't think I've had a single meeting or conversation with Mr. Doran where he's not brought up his children, his concern for his children, and the impact that all of this is having on his children.

But getting back to Allen and the horizontal departure. Assuming the Court wanted to factor in that Assault 2 in 1990 that doesn't score his criminal history, and even the homicide, which would at most add another three levels, his range is, like, 27 to 33 months, and we would make a recommendation at the high end of that range. And Allen approved of this method. It's -- at least it's tied to the Guidelines. It has some grounding. It's anchored in the Guidelines.

Now, the government cites a number of cases where courts did vary from the Guidelines. I would point out a few things about those cases. Most of those cases were variances that were not proportionally as extreme as the one we have here. I think there was one that was similar. It was someone with a range of 135 months, and

the court imposed probation. In that case the reason for the downward variance was because of the offense-related conduct. That person during the course of the offense was a passive participant in the offense. And I think the thread going through all of those, in addition to the magnitude was not so great as what the government is asking for, is that the variances were either based on the actual offense conduct that took the case out of the heartland, or the criminal history which was actually adjudicated, and here what the government is relying on and Probation, is an unadjudicated, unrelated offense that is completely different from this particular case.

The government cites the *Fitch* case. I think the *Fitch* case is a good contrast, because in that case the defendant killed the person in order to effectuate the fraud. It was explicitly found to be specifically related to that particular offense conduct, so the variance was approved. I would note that that variance was only two-and-a-half times what the Guidelines range was here. The government's variance is five times what the Guidelines range is here. The government --

THE COURT: Mr. Carroll, could I ask you a question on the relatedness issue? If the Defendant had gone to another state and not registered as a sex offender and then started a relationship with a woman,

1 and there was a violent crime that came out of that, 2 wouldn't that be considered related to the failure to 3 register as a sex offender? Because the statute actually has a specific punishment for if you commit a violent 4 crime in conjunction with your failure to register. 5 6 I mean, it may be a fiction to think that women are 7 actually checking the registry, but that is part of the 8 reason why we have a registry, is that so people can check it and see if there's a dangerous person either in 9 10 the community or someone they're about to date. 11 MR. CARROLL: Well, I would say that 12 initially -- well, 2250, I think, is distinguishable in 13 that situation, because Mr. Doran would actually have the 14 right to have the jury decide the crime of violence. 15 THE COURT: Sure. But if they did, wouldn't it 16 be a related crime? 17 MR. CARROLL: I -- I wouldn't suggest that -- I 18 don't think it would necessarily be a related crime. 19 wouldn't be very related to the fact of not registering. 20 This Court has found that Mr. Doran's homicide was not

I don't know if the fact that it was in Vietnam also is another distinguishing factor in that you would have no duty to register there as a sex offender either. But if you look at the cases in *Fitch* and -- and the other

related to the failure to register offense.

21

22

23

24

25

cases cited by the government, the thread is that, A, the 1 2 variances weren't that much and, secondly, the variances 3 were based on the actual offense conduct or something that was adjudicated in their criminal history. 4 5 Regarding the supervised release conditions, I was 6 prepared to go on, and now in light of the government's 7 concession, I'll try to cut my comments short. 8 THE COURT: Let me just ask Mr. Werner one thing 9 I didn't press him on. Do you agree that it's five years 10 and not lifetime on the term of supervised release? 11 MR. WERNER: Yes. I believe the Guideline term 12 is -- I think the maximum term the Court can impose is life. 13 14 THE COURT: You still think there is that 15 possibility? 16 MR. WERNER: Yes, Your Honor. But as we said in 17 our Memo, I think the Court would need to justify why the 18 Court would want more than five years at this time, so 19 there's --20 THE COURT: Okay. I just want to make sure on 21 that. 22 So you can certainly argue that one, Mr. Carroll. 23 MR. CARROLL: Thank you, Your Honor. 24 The government bears the burden of showing that it's 25 necessary and also the conditions must involve no greater

deprivation than necessary. I think there's a tendency to view supervised release conditions as something that's helpful for the defendant and -- forgetting that these are -- particularly sex offender conditions and evaluation conditions, they're onerous. They are things that are part of the punishment, and harsh conditions can actually negatively impact a person's reentry into society.

Regarding the length of the supervised release,
Mr. Doran would ask the Court to impose just five years.
That's what the Guidelines says. A lifetime period of supervision is an extraordinary departure from that
Guidelines recommendation. Courts who have looked at sex offender conditions have noted one of the factors to consider is the remoteness of the prior sex offense, and here we have a situation where Mr. Doran's last sex offense was in 1992.

Regarding the specific treatment condition that the government recommends -- again, the government agrees that this case isn't really about sex offending. It's more about power and control. Mr. Doran, of course, would object to that, and we don't concede that, but there has to be a showing that a sex offender evaluation is particularly needed in this case.

Mr. Doran did see a therapist when he was both in

1 prison and out of prison, Sally Wing, who's a certified 2 sex offender treatment provider, so he has had some 3 counseling, he's had some therapy in the past to address primarily anger issues, and an evaluation simply would 4 not be warranted in this case. 5 THE COURT: Mr. Carroll, I noticed only in 6 7 preparation for the sentencing in the last couple of days 8 that on the Judgment and Sentence out of Pierce County 9 for the rape, there's a reference to conditions to be 10 imposed consistent with the report of Dr. Harris. And I 11 assume that's Dr. G. Christian Harris who did psycho and 12 sexual evaluations back in the -- in that timeframe. Are 13 you aware of anything about that report? 14 MR. CARROLL: No, I'm not aware. I don't have 15 that -- that report. THE COURT: Okay. You don't have it either, of 16 17 course, or I would have seen it, Mr. Werner? 18 MR. WERNER: No, we don't. 19 MR. CARROLL: And I would point out that he 20 finished his supervision for that offense. He complied 21 with all of the conditions, and they closed his community 22 supervision on the case as part of that 13-year period 23 when he was doing well in the community. So in closing, Your Honor, the Court's required to 24 25 impose the minimum term necessary to achieve the goals of

1 sentencing. Ten years is more than is necessary. It is 2 also too extraordinary of a variance based on unrelated 3 and uncharged conduct, so we would ask for the Court to 4 impose 33 months. And we would also object to the -- the 5 evaluation conditions, the mental health conditions, the 6 length of community -- of supervised release recommended 7 by the Probation Department, and the MRT condition. 8 THE COURT: Okay. Thanks very much, 9 Mr. Carroll. 10 And I know that some of your research attorneys are 11 probably the ones who unearthed some of those relatedness 12 cases also, so well done for the public defender's 13 research lawyers. 14 Mr. Doran, is there anything you want to say today 15 before I impose the sentence? 16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 17 THE COURT: Okay. Would you go to the podium. 18 THE DEFENDANT: I know that today you're going 19 to sentence me, and I hope it's for the crime that I 20 committed by going out of state to provide for my kids to 21 work. As far as the Vietnam issue, I really think there's a whole lot of evidence, physical evidence 22 23 especially, that didn't get as much weight given to it as 24 it should have. There's more to this story than -- than 25 what was brought out to you.

This woman never watched my children. Sure, I dated her. I was in a relationship with her. But she wanted me to bring her to America, and I had no plans to do that. I think it's imperative to know that at the same time that she was going out with me, she was also engaged with -- with a man from Australia.

I'm really hoping this Court does not misconstrue what I'm saying. I'm not trying to discredit her all. What I'm trying to do is explain.

This woman was intent on getting out of Vietnam by any means necessary. I met her by helping her when she got hit by a taxi, and started a relationship after that. But the things that took place, the way that she was when she was around my children, I -- I couldn't have that, and the fact that she -- she was intent on pushing the issue for me to bring her to America, and then when I ended up breaking up with her, she sent the gangsters after me and followed us and had my children threatened. And there's evidence that -- that wasn't provided to you that clearly states that people were aware of this. And the investigation that went on in Vietnam, it -- I don't know -- I don't know how to explain it to you so you understand, but it works completely differently over there, and to say, "cover up," is an understatement.

I think that -- that if this would have been

investigated when I first came in -- I know that due to the budget restraints and everything, it took three years to be able to get financing to send Mr. Stansell over there. But given the fact of what happened to him when he got there as far as being able to do the investigation, I think that -- that has a lot to do with this. Plus the physical evidence that -- that -- I never -- have never and will never deny that they came into the house, and they attacked me and my children, and I protected my children.

Did I kill her? Absolutely not. Did I wrap her in a blanket like they said, and wrap her head in a bag and stuff her in a closet? Absolutely not. And there's not one piece of physical evidence that the government or anybody else has provided to me to be able to prove that unequivocally I'm responsible for it instead of the other people that I have stated from the very beginning that are involved with this.

There was a credit card found at the scene. There was an unidentified handprint on the storage door to where her body was found. And I'm sorry that she died, but I am not the one that put her in the physical condition that they found her.

They're -- from the very beginning I tried to aid the investigation by sending my business partner information

to the police to -- with names and phone numbers of two women who -- who were local that saw Ms. Ngoc bring the gangsters after me. And she went and talked with them and was asking where I was. When I was at the consulate, they called me and told me that it was not safe for my children and myself to return there. Her boss even says that -- that she was aware of the fiancé in Australia, and asked her why she wasn't just going to stay with him, and she said that she wanted to come to America instead of Australia; that there was no -- there was no guarantee that Australia was going to -- going to happen.

My point is this: Yeah, I protected my kids. I didn't kill anybody, though, and there's no physical evidence that's been shown. The only blood that was found at the scene was from my son when she was beating my son, Your Honor. I don't know what I can say.

They — they would not let me bring forth the evidence that I wanted to bring forth that I think this Court should have been aware of to be able to make your decision.

And I understand that you found me guilty based on the limited amount of evidence that you were provided.

Most of it was hearsay. I think that, for one, if

Mr. Williams' statements would have been dug into a little deeper, he had an argument or conflicting

agreement with the U.S. Marshal about whose mother was living at my house. Mr. Williams doesn't have any of the scenarios correct. He doesn't have any of the evidence correct as to what took place, and it's just -- I know that by my record from 1990 and 1992, I look terrible. You know what? I made some terrible mistakes. I was young. And I'm not using this for an excuse. Please, don't take it that way. I was on steroids. I was a young narcissistic young man, but that was half of my life ago. I got out in 1998, and I have not committed a crime until I went out of state and -- to work to provide for my children.

The issues that they wanted to bring up about the incident with my ex-wife, my son's mom, that was a reciprocal restraining order that the county did, because she was at a shelter all -- trying to ensure that she was not going to get deported, and I was given full custody of my children. I've never been violent with anybody since 1992.

The thing that's important about that incident is that the Court needs to understand and -- that Brenda Giacco, my ex-girlfriend, my victim from 1992, I lived a block and a half away from her, when I first got out, for a year and a half. We lived in Maple Valley for seven years in -- in the same small town. She wrote a letter

to be able to submit to the -- to the embassy to get my children's mother -- her visa approved, stating that she understands that sometimes people make bad mistakes, and explained that she didn't fear me or that I posed a threat to anybody else.

I filed multiple restraining orders against women in Washington state when there was a problem with a relationship ending that -- that I wanted to make sure that it wasn't going to be exacerbated. I've not been violent with anybody. I know that they want so badly, because of mistakes that I made before, for me to be guilty for this, but I already paid for my 1990 and 1992 crimes, and I proved for 13 years -- with a few traffic tickets. I got out on a Wednesday and went to work the following Monday and worked the whole time, even in a bad economy.

And all I did was I brought a woman here, and our marriage did not work out, but there was no violence. There was no domestic abuse. There was nothing like that. She wanted to stay in America, and we got divorced. I got sole custody of my children. My children are everything to me. They -- I can't explain to you how much my children mean to me.

And this incident that took place in Vietnam, you need to understand that you don't know everything that

took place and you -- all I did was protect my children.

I did not -- she was not in the condition that they found her in when I left my house. And without spreading a whole bunch of facts that I've been advised not to go into at this time, I don't know how to get you to understand that there's clearly a third party involved in this.

And I'm not trying to shift the blame. I'm really hoping that you're -- I'm taking responsibility by admitting that they came into the house, and they attacked us, and I -- and I protected my children. That was only after taking every single step to avoid this.

And -- and it was not anything on my part. It was the victim that was the one that was doing all the harassing, that was sending the gangsters, that -- that stole my money, that -- that had personal papers of mine, that -- there's no good reason at all for this person to have had this, nor did I ever know that this person had this. And because she would not take no for an answer, that this is -- this was what she ultimately did. She wanted to get out of Vietnam.

All I'm trying to do is explain that things work completely different over there, and -- we don't have gangsters here in America where I can have a problem with somebody and say, "I'll give you \$10 to go and do this to

this person," but it's clear that -- every Vietnamese person that grew up there knows that that's the way that it works, and it's --

I don't know what else to say without getting into too many facts that I've been advised not to go into at this time, but, you know -- I mean, I'm not -- I'm not trying to shift the blame. I'm taking responsibility for what I did. But I did not kill anyone and wrap them in a blanket and stuff them in a storage unit, and -- and there's not one piece of physical evidence that the government has provided that hasn't proved that it's not somebody else, just like I said it was.

And, again, I did everything I could to be able to get investigation into the two women that knew this, and the Vietnamese officer testified that he did not investigate them, but yet I have evidence to the contrary, that he was taken to that woman's house.

THE COURT: Okay. Thanks, Mr. Doran.

The matter is scored correctly by U.S. Probation as an offense level 14, criminal history category two, which yields a Guideline range of 18 to 24 months.

I came to the -- independent of Mr. Carroll, came to a similar conclusion that one way to approach this is to look at whether the criminal history is understated. I believe it is understated. You have the non-countable

forgery conviction from the 1980's. You have the non-counted Assault in the Second Degree conviction and, of course, we have this homicide conviction, which is not fully adjudicated and countable. So I do believe that a departure to a criminal history category four is a good starting point, which takes us to 27 to 33 months.

Then, I don't think the Court can use the homicide as a departure, but the Court can use it for a variance sentence. And the difference between a departure and a variance is set forth in the Allen case and in other cases, but in terms of doing what is the appropriate punishment, I look at the 3553 factors which, of course, include the issue of the history and characteristics of the Defendant, and the need to protect the public from further crimes of this Defendant, and I do find that Timothy Doran presents a clear and present danger to any woman who he establishes a romantic relationship with.

On multiple occasions he's demonstrated remarkable levels of violence and depravity aimed at women he claims to love or cherish: This felony assault on his first wife, his violent and sadistic rape of his girlfriend, and finally the vicious strangulation of his girlfriend in Vietnam, followed by stuffing the body where he knew it would not be found for a significant time.

All these events establish two things: One, that his

criminal history category of two significantly undercounts his prior criminal history and should be readjusted to a category four and, secondly, on the 3553 factors, Mr. Doran presents a strong case for why a longer sentence is needed to protect the public from further crimes of the Defendant.

These offenses above and that we talked about here show that the history and characteristics of Mr. Doran demand a longer sentence than the Guideline range or even the adjusted Guideline range. Therefore, the Court goes to the top of the adjusted range, 33 months, and triples that sentence, for a total sentence of 99 months' imprisonment. This variance upward from 33 months has to be looked at on a percentage basis, and it is 300 percent, and in a length-of-increase basis, and here that is 66 months which, of course, is double the 33 months.

These increases are within reason given the case law cited to me about how the Court can use an uncharged, out-of-country homicide in conjunction with all the other factors to craft a sentence that does not run afoul of the legal restrictions of related to the offense of conviction in these cited cases. So, ultimately, the Court determines that this 99-month term of imprisonment is the reasonable sentence considering all aggravating and mitigating circumstances, but is the absolute minimum

necessary to provide punishment which is sufficient but not greater than necessary.

So, Mr. Doran, you are sentenced to a 99-month term of imprisonment. I will impose five years of supervised release. I believe that is the appropriate period of time. And you will be subject to standard conditions as well as the following special conditions: You will cooperate in the collection of DNA. You must not possess any firearm or destructive device. You will submit to drug or alcohol testing, and you will participate as instructed by U.S. Probation in any program approved by Probation for treatment of narcotic addiction, drug dependency or substance abuse, which will include testing. You must abstain from the use of alcohol and all other intoxicants during supervision. Your history of abusing steroids is consistent with the need for this -- these two testing and treatment conditions.

You will submit to search of your person, residence, office, safe deposit box, storage unit, property or vehicle, conducted in a reasonable time and manner by law enforcement or Probation. You will participate, as directed, in the Moral Reconation Therapy program. You will also participate in any mental health treatment or counseling program approved by Probation and contribute to the cost of any programs to the extent that you're

financially able to do so.

I am not going to impose any specific sex offender treatment requirements that would follow the conviction of a sex offense, because this is not sex offense, and this -- you are not the kind of person who is dangerous to children, you are not the kind of person who is dangerous to strangers like a Ted Bundy. You are dangerous to people who you establish a relationship with and are a serial domestic abuser, and these conditions simply don't relate to that at all.

So I think that -- is there anything else,

Mr. Werner, that you wanted on there that I didn't cover

one way or the other?

MR. WERNER: Two issues, Your Honor. We did not want the financial information -- well, condition, and I wasn't sure if the Court was going to strike that condition.

THE COURT: I did not impose that one, so we can strike that one.

MR. WERNER: What we did want, Your Honor, would be conditions eight and nine from the Probation Office's recommendation. That's the fact making the -- his compliance with SORNA a condition of supervised release, and then number nine, as we briefly discussed, I do think the Court should impose a sexual deviancy evaluation,

perhaps striking the physiological testing and the 1 2 requirement to turn over past mental health documents. 3 THE COURT: Got it. I will impose the condition that you are required 4 5 under the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act 6 to comply with all the requirements of the Act, report 7 your address, where you will reside, and any subsequent 8 change of residence to Probation, register as a sex 9 offender in any jurisdiction where you reside, are 10 employed, or a student, and register in the jurisdiction 11 in which you were convicted, and must -- you must 12 register within three business days after your 13 sentencing -- or after your release from custody, I 14 should say, after serving this sentence. I'm not going 15 to order the sexual deviancy evaluation, however. 16 don't believe that is required under the circumstances. 17 I will waive the fine for inability to pay. There is 18 a \$100 Special Assessment, which is due immediately. 19 Then, Mr. Carroll, are you recommending now the 20 Tucson facility instead of the Phoenix facility? 21 MR. CARROLL: Yes, that's correct. 22 THE COURT: Okay. So I'll recommend FCI Tucson. 23 And then you had an issue about return of property. 24 I got your Motion seems like only in the last day or two. 25 Mr. Friedman, do you know anything about that?

```
1
              MR. FRIEDMAN: I do. It was just filed
2
     yesterday. We have no objections, so we were -- I guess
3
     if we could keep a slight window open. We normally have
     a week to answer. I expect to file something tomorrow
4
5
     saying we're fine returning --
6
              THE COURT: Okay. I'm not sure -- obviously,
7
     the Marshals have some, but some of it might still be
8
     back in the Dakotas with the local police. So we'll sort
9
     it out, and anything that we have in the United States'
10
     custody will be returned, and then beyond that, there's
11
     not much we can do.
12
              MR. FRIEDMAN: And if I could just state that
13
     almost certainly we'll file something saying that we
14
     agree to that, but we just wanted to finish consulting.
15
              THE COURT: Right. We'll wait for the
16
     government's response in that area.
17
         And was there anything else from the government that
18
     I needed to address?
19
              MR. WERNER: Not from our perspective, Your
20
     Honor.
21
              THE COURT: And, Mr. Carroll, did I cover the
22
     things you wanted me to cover?
23
              MR. CARROLL: Yes, Your Honor. I have one other
24
     thing. Mr. Doran will certainly appeal this.
              THE COURT: Yes.
25
```

1 MR. CARROLL: And what I would ask, given his 2 statements, as I think were made clear to the Court, one 3 of the issues is going to be the effectiveness of his 4 counsel. What I suggest is that the Court authorize CJA 5 to appoint counsel for appeal. The Federal Defenders 6 will file the Notice of Appeal, clean up the return of 7 property issues, and then hand the case over to appellant 8 counsel with the Court's permission. 9 THE COURT: Well, certainly, you know, 10 Mr. Doran, you have the right to appeal the sentence I've 11 imposed here today to the United States Court of Appeals, 12 and if you want to appeal, you must file that notice 13 within 14 days of today. And if you can't afford the 14 cost of the appeal, the government will pay them for you. 15 And if you want an attorney for the appeal and cannot 16 afford one, the Court will appoint an attorney for you, 17 and the Clerk will assist you in preparing papers

So, Mr. Carroll, your proposal is spot on. Stay with the case until the Notice of Appeal is filed and the property matter is dealt with, and then, you know, it should be turned over to CJA counsel, and they'll take it from there.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

necessary for your appeal.

MR. CARROLL: Thank you, Your Honor.

Your Honor, there's one other issue that I think I've

raised in my Sentencing Memo, is that Mr. Doran, although 1 2 you're recommending Tucson, he has a telephonic custody 3 hearing at the end of this month, and I don't know if 4 there's a way to delay his designation or transfer to another facility until after that is done. 5 6 In my experience, and I think Mr. Doran understands 7 this too, once you're in transit with the BOP, that could 8 take a number of weeks, and the ability to make phone 9 calls and do things like that is really restricted. 10 THE COURT: You know, I can't -- I'm not going 11 to interfere in the Bureau of Prisons' processing. Their 12 considerations and their needs to move people on the 13 schedule that they determine is something that I'm simply 14 not privy to, so I don't want to impose any new 15 restrictions or problems for them, so I'm not going to 16 enter into that. You can try the Bureau of Prisons on

that one.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CARROLL: And I've reviewed the Judgment.

THE COURT: Sure. You can hand it to Mr. Werner and, Mr. Werner, you can approach.

Okay. I've signed the Judgment in the case. Thank you, Counsel, for the excellent work through the years. To Mr. Carroll and Mr. Stansell and the entire Public Defender's office, you did a really fabulous job for Mr. Doran, and I appreciate the quality of your work

```
1
      every step of the way.
           We'll be adjourned. Thank you.
 2
 3
                (End of Proceedings)
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
1
                          \underline{C} \ \underline{E} \ \underline{R} \ \underline{T} \ \underline{I} \ \underline{F} \ \underline{I} \ \underline{C} \ \underline{A} \ \underline{T} \ \underline{E}
 2
      STATE OF WASHINGTON)
                             ) ss.
 3
      County of King
           I, the undersigned Notary Public in and for the
 4
 5
      State of Washington, do hereby certify:
 6
           That the foregoing verbatim transcript of
 7
      proceedings was transcribed under my direction; that the
 8
      transcript is a full, true and complete transcript of
 9
      the testimony of said witness, including all questions,
10
      answers, objections, motions and exceptions;
11
           That I am not a relative, employee, attorney or
12
      counsel of any party to this action or relative or
13
      employee of any such attorney or counsel, and that I am
14
      not financially interested in the said action or the
15
      outcome thereof;
16
           That I am herewith securely sealing and digitally
17
      signing this transcript and delivering the same via
18
      electronic filing to the Clerk of the Court.
19
           IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and
20
      affixed my official seal this 10th day of October, 2014.
21
22
                              /S/ Leslie Waltzer
23
                              Notary Public in and for the State
                              of Washington, residing at Issaquah
24
25
```